

Remarks:

This amendment is submitted in an earnest effort to advance this case to issue without delay. The examiner has indicated that the case contains allowable subject matter.

The specification has been amended to eliminate some minor obvious errors. Similarly some clear errors in claim 24 have been corrected in a manner that in no way widens the scope of this claim but that merely improves its language. No new matter whatsoever has been added.

Dependent claim 10, which depended directly from independent apparatus claim 24, and dependent claim 20, which depended directly from independent method claim 25, have been found to contain allowable subject matter. Accordingly this amendment places the subject matter of claim 24 into claim 10 and that of claims 25 and 20 into new independent claim 26, so that claims 10 and 26 are allowable. Claim 20 has been canceled and the fee for one extra independent claim is paid herewith.

The objection to the subject matter of "pressurizing the housing around the periphery of the rotor with housing air at a superatmospheric pressure" is incorrect. The clean version of the specification states in lines 10 to 13 of page 3 that "the housing

enclosing the rotor at its periphery is filled with housing or sealing air, and that the pressure of the housing or sealing air is higher than the pressure of the airflow through the rotor." Going further, lines 10 and 11 of page 4 refer to "housing 2 which is under excess or superatmospheric pressure." Thus every word of the phrase being objected to has direct and exact support in the specification on file. The §112 objection must be withdrawn

The art rejection on EP 0,588,185 of Kritzler is based on a misunderstanding of the air flows in the instant invention or in Kritzler. In the instant invention air flowing out of the separators is applied on both faces of the rotor so as to effectively separate the two streams flowing through their respective sectors through the heat-exchange rotor. Instead, in Kritzler as shown in FIG. 4 input pipes 24 and 25 feed barrier gas into the peripheral chamber 15 and purging gas into the radial chamber. The upper radial chamber 15 serves for pulling out these two flows. In Kritzler no gas exits at the lower side, which is wholly contrary to the system of this invention.

In addition as described in Kritzler with reference to FIG. 4 gas is exhausted upward through the radial chamber 15. There is no hint in Kritzler that after exiting the radial chamber 15 this gas serves to separate streams flowing through the rotor.

More particularly, the last paragraph of column 6 of Kritzler '185, which is the only one relating to FIG. 4, is translated as follows:

The regenerative heat exchanger 200 shown in FIG. 4 is different from the embodiment of FIG. 3 mainly only in that the connections 24 and 25 are reversed, that is oriented according to the arrows 27 to feed barrier or purging gas into the peripheral chamber 3 or the radial chamber 15. In addition there is only one conduit 28 on the upper radial chamber 15 via which the supplied barrier or purge gas can be vented after flowing through the barrier-chamber and seal system.

Thus in the FIG. 4 system the barrier or purge gas serves to control turbulence in the stream 6 leaving the rotor so that, lacking further means for separating the flows 5 and 6, there is no mixing of the flows 5 and 6.

This is wholly contrary to the instant invention as defined in claims 24 and 25 where the streams 21 from the separators 19 and 20, one directed axially at one face of the rotor 3 and the other at the opposite face of the rotor 3 separate the flows on the respective faces of the rotor 3. Thus the flow 5, 6 is fully segregated from the flow 8, 9 while heat is exchanged between them by the revolving rotor 3.

There is absolutely no suggestion to provide air-stream separation at both upstream and downstream faces of a rotor in

Kritzler. Hence the rejection thereon is incorrect and the claims are allowable under §102 and §103. Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

If only minor problems that could be corrected by means of a telephone conference stand in the way of allowance of this case, the examiner is invited to call the undersigned to make the necessary corrections.

K.F. Ross P.C.

/Andrew Wilford/

by: Andrew Wilford, 26,597
Attorney for Applicant

16 December 2009
5683 Riverdale Avenue Box 900
Bronx, NY 10471-0900
Cust. No.: 535
Tel: 718 884-6600
Fax: 718 601-1099
Email: email@kfrpc.com

Enclosure: None.